

Hi velocity translational skiing and the **beam-people-there**
Transporter. Could phonons, plasmons (arrays of atoms and holes that move; physically translate, while retaining order), or higher velocity spintronic equivalents, propagate information as little plasmonic groups cross edges through a medium, possibly a preservative or amplifying medium, to transport the specific layout of atoms, and just possibly some of their quantum states to a Reader like a 3d embroidery hoop or coating surrounding the object. The plasmons migrating might have error-reduction bitwise operations similar to a cellular automata to preclude data dilution with propagation out to the plasmon reader coating.

I hard about something called

spintronics; does spintronics have a plasmon/phonon equivalent? Spintronics could be much higher velocity than electron hole plasmons.

Plasmon/phonon data reporting transporter Applications such as knowing what is inside a crystal could possibly go with **new radiation, particle, and vibration (like Thz), EM, detectors to make new kinds of sensors**. New kinds of sensors benefits robots and automation.

It is well travelled at things I write, but could the new scientist quantum camera that makes a figurine outline from quantum-entangled photon absorption at the figurine surface simulataneously at the sensing surface of the computer camera to make an image of the figure without a direct/transmission/reflected optical

path be combined with a plamonic/phonic crystal to create new kinds of detectors. **Combining quantum camera with plamonics creates new detectors and depth vision.** The phonons would migrate until they reached an edge or a crystal anomaly (from the crystal detecting something), then on reaching a crystal novelty-center would change and cause their different sibling quantum-linked phonon or plasmon, which was at the surface of a reader/sensor, like a computer camera (at the figurine example), to be specifically quantum polarized (possible spin polarized) from entanglement; that images the 3d shape as well as likely the energy level and form of the thing the first plasmon reacts to. **This is a way of seeing at depth of materials, possibly 3d computer chips,** or even cytomaterials or tissues as when

you put a nanosized plasmon generating crystal next to a cyte, then the nanocrystal makes propagating phonons/plamons which wash up and possibly penetrate the cytomembrane and cytostructure, while what they see/react to is recorded from the quantum camera effect.

One vague idea I have about reading plamonics/phonons at a perimeter or edge is that little or large organic molecules could have a plasmonic representation; say the edge of a quiltlike plasmon just touches the edge of a little organic molecule, like a carbohydrate. The quilt hops around the carbohydrate molecule, Near-touching, plasmonically/phononically modifying the plamon-quilt, without reacting chemically with the carbohydrate. So rather than an atomic force microscope tip, the

plasmonic quilt changes its internal plasmon matrix (possibly an actively computing matrix like a cellular automata) at each of the c-c-c of the carbohydrate. The carbohydrate goes unreacted but it is read/stored plasmonically. Just for niftyness: I read about a time crystal at wikipedia, sort of a crystal with more than one stable ground state so it automatically rotates through states; so **a plasmonic/phononic time crystal could iterate the matrix-quilt while transporting measurements to a quilt-internal or external computer/sensor.**

Math of statistics and finding things out: A human looking at a map of US states and counties can tell which are the richest. Then, as a lay perceptor, I think humans do actual

math correlations/other equations and/or just gaze at the way overlain data sets fit. People looking at previously uncombined data sets sometimes find new (perceived) trends which can then be tested as hypothesis.

database comparisons as **instantaneous statements of matrix data** are reminiscent of finding actual predictive relationships at data, that could be tested, or have highly unique probability of occurring other than by chance (like a P value, but better and nonspecific); So looking at the counties you could predict college attendance by county wealth, even if you were absent a theory as to why.

So that brings up the math of what is **the minimal matrix or block size**

to make a 2d map overlain on an integer dataset. Like, how good a tic-tac-toe board or hexagonal tile plane do you need to get a semivisual guide to data 1) where a human glancing at the visual it would see a trend (fMRI) 2) where an AI, like a deep learning AI, would imitate a human glancing and find a trend, and 3) where some actual math at an actual formula would find a trend (like multimodality or even east-west gradient at tic tac toe board) parsimoniously from less data.

So are there entire areas of the observable universe that fulfill the math of hypothesisless true correlation? These might be an area of science, and the technology that comes from it, that are particularly easy and effective to investigate. This brings up a new

(undecidability notation) form of D3 island of truthiness; an physics and other science actual area separate from deduction or induction.

My perception is that some of science, like physics, uses reduction (simplification) to produce predictable, modellable components, like electrons or photons or math-fields, then build up larger things from these; the esteem goes to the theories that most effectively build up models that accurately predict the observed universe. That process reminds me of a combination of induction and deduction. That said if math areas of hypothesisless correlation create islands of truthiness (D3) completely outside and different than induction and/or deduction then there could be a restatement of physics, and new physics research, based on math

areas of hypothesisless truthiness.
The only one
(math;hypothesisless;truthiness) that I
think of instantly is the dubious (yet
possibly testable): Math winnowing of
anthropic principle variants at a
multiverse kind of set-theory implies:
If you perceive you exist, then it must
be at a physics that permits that.

**Now testability matters, notably
at core, as there is not way to tell
if an actual existing system is
constructed in part with a non-
hypothesisless math component.
Keep doing the science
experiments.**

Math entertainment:

Math Description of a universe where
correlation is always causation; then
finding areas at our universe-we-live-
in that have or approximate that

mathematical set-up.

Looking at a map of US counties colored on wealth, then comparing any other thing to it might often generate *testable* hypothesis. That is normal during 2019 AD. Are there truth regions possible without a hypothesis? Areas of validity without doing a subsequent experiment based on measuring the new hypothesis? That would be really different, and kind of like finding (math/data) places of accurate knowledge (at undecidability notation a new kind of D3 local-truth island); The thing is, could there be a math description of a simple matrix, like a tic tac toe board, where to have two matrices compared the **statistics-equations would always have to be true**, that is like doing the math the P value would always definitionally be $p=0.0$. At

such a math space if you saw any data trend with your human vision it would always be certain, rather than competitive with chance, and would always be true; Interestingly no hypothesis is necessary to then make a statement about the system, “Rich counties have more plastic cards” or something. Also, even if the math works, **it might not be a hypothesisless certainty** because the Godel incompleteness theorem and the Quoran’s statement that addition and multiplication are math unprovable as to repeatability, so only for certain assumptions of mathematics would hypothesisless “true” correlations exist.

It would be great to find or make big datasets, with the math permitted hypothesisless correlations which were

mathematical-space definitionally true. Those equations derived from the data could then be used predictively at what might be entirely new datasets with the same math-matrix-true math organization (or of course you could just process the first 10% of a big dataset. find the “hypothesisless truthiness effects” and then isolate those “truelike” areas or data of interest at the other 90% of the data set.

Could sensors be built around hypothesisless matrix-true math; these physical sensors could then make something like an image (like self-driving car video) where if you can predict it, with any, of a group of equations, it is true.

Could there be a new kind of statistical process control based

on a math of hypothesisles true correlation spaces?

Encouraging new physics technologies and hypothesis; Could big physics, like colliders, have a math-built-in setup so at experiments constructed a certain way, if it was measured, you could know it exists, as compared with making a dozen (gravity waves) to a few billion (lasers) measurements to compare/contrast to stochastics of chance. “Well, we constructed the new physics experiment out of two tic-tac-toe boards; overlain, if we see anything, with computers or our human vision, it’s mathematically supported as an actual effect. I think an engineer might point out that the math of your gravity wave detector might be tight but an oversize load truck driving above it could instantly make the plurality of measurements,

at a preexisting math of unlikely-to-be-chance, the better guiding math.

MWI:

Can a person define or generate a multiverse universe with the math of predictive certainty, absent generating and verifying a hypothesis, with a defined or undefined future? That could make “create once, run well, terminate predictably and well” universes, with or without sentience. Can sentience be created in a math-space universe where if it can be thought, it is true (hypothesisless certainty); this provides benefit to the inhabitants as they are always right, about everything, no matter what they think. Noting nonrepeating cellular automata from simple things like the 1,1,0 guide, such that at a: if you can think it, it’s true; form of universe, it

could/would still be continually generating fresh previously unknown beneficial material. That gives what we will call “people” or “humans” the ability to always be right at thoughts, yet be nondetermined and “unclockworklike” at their perceived universe.

“People looking at previously uncombined data sets sometimes find new (perceived) trends which can then be tested as hypothesis.”

Ok, so how is hypothesisless truthiness different than the “=” symbol in an equation? Also, are there non-turing cellular automata, different than 1,1,0 (Wolfram company) turing automata, that create D3 regions of hypothesisless truthiness? These non-turing-computers that produce

regions of truth are ways of finding something out, yet, are computer-science expanding and alluring because they are non-turing machines.

If you embed a non-turing cellular automata inside another non-turing automata, do you get a self-editing system that can edit itself to produce an output rather than using a loop? These could be Instant-math (as compared with iterating) problem solvers. One possibility (like perturbing one tiny branchlet of a fractal with the preference of changing the macrostructure of the entire fractal) is to rewrite the surrounding automata1 with the average, or mode, of the internal nested (embedded) automata2. That causes the most frequent output (mode) of automata2

to completely reshape automata1
which its subset automata2
generates. I somehow think that if you
rewrite the surrounding structure with
the mode of automata2 that this
differs from computer-science
recursion. So I think the idea
generally is to do computing without a
turing machine, and to change big
things with tiny modifications at a
branch.

Ok, just to do some quora-based
reacting, it seems like the vast
majority of things at the observable
universe that get measured have
multi-item multicomponent parts.
There is even the notion that the
normal distribution (frequent at
things) is sourced from basic
combinatorics. So when physicists
and others make an effort to describe
a newly measured or theorized system

like the multiverse, is presuming things like “a flat universe, or a round universe” missing out as a result of simplification (simplify to build constructables from)? Is there a math and theory legitimate way to note, previously inductively*, that middle complexity is the usual thing, so a testable middle complexity theory could have value? Big computers, deep learning and AI could possibly start with nearer to middle complexity new models of new physics measurements, technologies, and new physics theories and then isolate their heightened predictive ability from a middle-complexity theory source. “instead of radiating from a point source, an origin universe radiates from multiple sources, metaphorically similar to a distribution gaussian of Boltzmann brains” as a comic yet nifty version. As I am

writing things for online publishing It is my duty to be accurate and earnest, yet I am amused with the idea that boltzmann brains, each with their own anthropic principle zone, expand towards each other, then the ones that get along together persist, causing peace in the multiverse.

*I note “previously inductively” because (repeat measurements -> induction featuring math improvements) yet if mathematically constructable hypothesisless correlators (where correlation, at those specific systems, from the parsimoniousness of the math, possibly matrix-math causes correlation to always = causation at that definitional space) can create math spaces in utilized physics, theoretical physics, and technologized objects, then **those new things are**

**outside induction and deduction;
that seems new to me and could
be useful.**

Possible reply: because FEA (finite element analysis) works: the aggregates of minimal descriptions actually are predictive. Being predictive they have value. If you presume middle-complexity, modellability from parts (even FEA or theories built around collections of definitional minimal sized forms); still, middle complexity forms could have value and/or be better predictors. think of some zig-zaggy squares mde with pinking shears; you can tessellate those, so metaphorically middle-complexity object-chunks can have predictive capacity at various fabrics, including theories.

I can see how AI can improve physics and the technologies that arise from

it.

Is there a middle complexity math thing (thus possibly a physics thing) that you could not find from testing or aggregating mini-components, that actually exists and influences the human experienced universe? Say the idea of a Gaussian, absent the actual collection of points. It does have predictive power, but you might not even posit its existence based on a series of individual measurements of theory components.

Another area of middle complexity might be (creating/explaining) emergent properties, although, minimized component definitions are something I am writing about with a tropism towards expanding beyond them, it would be nifty if emergent properties, rather than just generating

a catalog of new emergent properties, possibly even one generated at an AI that makes vast quantities of permitted shapes “while you were modelling a spherical point, the AI just said “pringle”! or “Hey, non-orientable surface!” producing a big catalog of new emergent properties people could then use. The AI or software is producing a whole bunch of “middle complexity” data primitives as compared with building up from components.

So what physical systems could be hypothesisless? At a plonkish level, I am reminded of the idea that if you just make things out of atoms, then the math-biasing of those systems, and (truthiness-at-matter) math regions where correlation always=causation, might be

automatic.

Everettian many worlds, as I perceive it, comes from making the math function at the schroedinger equation. So it is at least a noniductive math-space. Even though things like the schroedinger equation only predict they hydrogen atom (20th century AD version). I once thought, among other possibilities, that since MWI depends on the schroedinger equation, and the schrodinger equation, during the 20th century AD, predicts the hydrogen atom that perhaps MWI universes might be generated composed only of those things that the scroedinger equation can actually predict; so at a minimum, entire new universes made up only of hydrogen and space, which if I imitate 20th century physics, then have a gravity thing where they become

stellar objects. So every new universe would be a “diffuse bang” that then did the predicted physics things to form stuff.

Just thought I would type that for entertainment.

I do not have any idea about the truth of the Many Worlds Interpretation of physics (MWI) but I have thought of approaches and technologies to test the MWI.

Possible reply: because FEA (finite element analysis) works; aggregate minimal descriptions actually are predictive, and if you presume middle-complexity, modellability from parts (even FEA or theories built around collections of definitional minimal sized forms)

Although big computers might be able to do something with: **middle-complexity as being the new models that are then used with first-principles to generate new hypothesis, new physics and new technology.** I am reminded of what I perceive are called Platonic forms; comparatively rich things that have nonreducible meaning. It is possible some of the middle complexity forms that the software finds will go well with human cognition styles, causing actual humans to make new theories, hypotheses, and technologies.

Lets say a human hears from a computer, "If you do not know where you are, you are likely in the middle" so then the human thinks, "perhaps then **I am a mid-sized sentient organism; could there be tinier sentient organisms than me?**"

Then the human devises an experiment to look for something like extraterrestrial life not in outer space, but in tinier regions of existing human space. They find out that the immune system is capable of not just doing what the body says, but is capable of learning (brief or lengthy) programs of its own, and even generating new programs. Not necessarily a communicateable-with-sentience yet novel to me.

Encouragingly for the middle-sizeists the volume of the human immune system is within an order of magnitude of the volume of the human brain. If it is possible that the number of recombinations of an immune system is larger than the number of neurons at a human brain then there is a, “no emergence yet

noted” computational basis for something as effective as a human brain. Perhaps the immune system is a P-zombie! Experiments are then thought of to ask the immune system if it is sentient, or just a computer that writes its own programs.

So, the middle-complexity forms could have value generating new science and technology.

(
dfiuhuihf an MWI moment.
edit that to: GTKG
)

Delayed quantum choice eraser (DQCE) notes as prompted with reading the wikipedia article https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Delayed-choice_quantum_eraser#Other_delayed-choice_quantum-

eraser_experiments on DQCE:

“pointed out that when these assumptions are applied to a device of interstellar dimensions, a last-minute decision made on Earth on how to observe a photon could alter a decision made millions or even billions of years ago” **That suggests some MWI technology like observing a more human-beneficial anthropic principle prior to theorized coalescence of the human starting planetary system.**

Although, I have been told by a time traveller, JY, the human experience world, possibly the universe was created.

More wikipedia: “While delayed-choice experiments have **confirmed the seeming ability of measurements made on photons in the present**

to alter events occurring in the past, this requires a non-standard view of quantum mechanics. If a photon in flight is interpreted as being in a so-called "superposition of states", i.e. if it is interpreted as something that has the potentiality to manifest as a particle or wave, but during its time in flight **is neither**, then there is no time paradox. This is the standard view, and recent experiments have supported it." So that brings up set theory, and the possible definitions of an unexamined set. There's structure, like "there are set elements", or a "set without elements". As well as things of unknown validity I have glimpsed at Quora, like "photons are a field", **so does a field, being a set element, have an effect, possibly testable with a new DQCE experiment, on retrocausal action?** I have a

feeling it is well described at physics, but the math description of the field, that when observed, expresses itself as a photon, is unknown to me. **Does it have any mutually exclusive parts even though it is a field?**

Perhaps since it precedes wave-nature it is absent doing node and antinode things, but **has a shape like a U**

(more likely to be actualized as a photon near its emission point or near something like an atom that gloms it) with the anisotropy of the distal parts of the U having a DQCE testability or effect.

Is there anything about a photon field that has a separable quantizable (quantum) state that is separate from/different than the quantum states (even spectral levels) of the photon. For different photons to have different energies yet all be considered to be a field, that suggests there is some,

potentially readable (detectable), component that supports/comprises wavelength or frequency. **Can you observe just a frequency of a photon field without observing the photon, and do DQCE experiment with that observation?**

A quoran says, of photon fields, "Electric charges interact with each other exchanging photons with energies proportional to their frequencies." which suggests that if as it says, EM fields are based on photon influence which differs from absorption/re-emission, **then maybe the charge of an electron wobbles a little if you partially observe the photon field that it's EM is composed of, or just perhaps a system that would ordinarily be just short of the energy to jump**

an electron up a quantum level to make a (detectable) photon emission can get extra energy from a partial photon-field observation (perhaps something hinting at wavelength). Thus showing that some enquiry short of producing an actual photon, at the photonic field can effect other matter and/or energy. That field effect could then be used at a new DQCE retrocausality experiment where the photon field has (or perhaps has not!) quantizable pre-photon characteristics.

Another Quoran writes, "I think the answer is there in pair production and annihilation along with other hard scientific evidence such as the Einstein-de Haas effect. We can make an electron and a positron out of

photons in gamma-gamma pair production. Then we can diffract electrons and positrons. and then when we annihilate them, we get the photons back. So the electron and the positron are in themselves a *configuration* of the photon field.”

That seems to suggest **it is possible to make many varieties of action, mass. or activity at a photon field.**

It is possible some of those numerous varied photon field possibilities could be used to clarify the “has the potentiality to manifest as a particle or wave, but during its time in flight is “neither” “ thing that says “neither” is absent retrocausality. Perhaps some specialized versions of photon fields support retrocausality directly as they are absent “neither”ness.

Those retrocausal custom “neither”less photon-fields could then

be measured as to their possible (potentially valuable) chronological isolation, if any, from the global experience of time. Also, these “neither”less photon fields could perhaps be found at nature. If findable at nature then they could be observed at a far distance, thus beneficially changing the human inhabited universe retrocausally.

Are photon fields **near matter** nearly always particle-or wave-ized, that might make the retrocausality of the DQCE the usual effect at matter or near matter as most photons around humans are also near matter or electrons. Is it rare that a photon-field would go preobserved/unobserved? Also, what about the thing where it says electrons communicate/share effect via a photon field? Is that electron distance so minute that it is

absent photon-field determinacy, suggesting DQCE works differently on electron systems as compared with atom systems?

What if you retrocausally modify an atom (a neither-less DQCE occurrence) yet the atom has electrons? Do you get blended, optimizable, results? Can the blend be customized to produce beneficial new technologies like chronological insulators or amplifiers? Like: Nucleus retrocausal at DQCE, electrons: resolved as particle compared with: Nucleus retrocausal at DCQE, electrons resolved as wave; do they have different DQCE retrocausal effects or produce engineerable time technologies?

Retrocausality might be stronger with more massive objects: Also, as to

DQCE retrocausality going with wave or particle ness rather than “neither”ness Are there any atomic particles or other things (even macroscopic quantum things I have read about; like 2mm at 2018 AD) That always have either waveness or particleness. I think a blob of matter 3x the size of the double slit’s separation distance is likely, statistically, usually a prticle, although there is a real finite chance it will wave its way through the double slit. The thing is though, does the preponderance of one state cause DCQE retrocauslity prevalence notably at blobs of matter? i doubt it is a ratio, but what if DCQE retrocausality is like the ratio (probability distribution) of macroscopic waveness or particleness : “neitherness” . That doubtful ratio thing would cause macroscopic blobs of matter to be

more retrocausally affectible.

What if you use a preobserved blob of matter, so that you already have it described as a wave or particle before it meets the DQCE apparatus? It still gets its wave/particle opportunity, again, at the DQCE, yet you know what you have utilized at it. I am kind of being extraploative, but one of the 1999 AD DQCE things is observing the system later, to change a photon's path retrocausally; Could either omitting or recording the state, or at a subsequent perhaps after-experiment moment, viewing the matter-blob's first definitional wave/particleness have an effect on the DQCE part of the apparatus? If the idea is to observe it first, to prevent "neitherness" causing actual retrocausal effects, does omitting a

record of the form-producing pre DCQE observation have an effect?

What if the DQCE with photons or diffractable/particleizable matter, does the initial measurement/characterization of the matter-blob as one of its available retrocausal actions; **this is possibly a constructible time-feedback technology.**

Another Quoran says, “the energy, momentum and angular momentum associated with a specific excitation of the photon field vanishes, while at the same time the properties of a corresponding excitation of the electron field (which we perceive as an electron) change. “
So from an MWI perspective are there universe differences based on these

possibly isolatable elements: “the energy, momentum and angular momentum associated with a specific excitation of the photon field...[excites an electron]” so the MWI universe from an electron doing an emissions level attainment and photon emission event could possibly be customized with modifying angular momentum of the energizing photon; or possibly doing some impressive laser thing where the photon re-emission occurs at some externally guided momentum or angular momentum, or spin. Like I read you can direct spin with magnets or lasers, so re-emitting a photon in a magnetic field could effect the MWI universe generated. The quote mentions three things so there are three factorial variations, that could affect the new MWI universe, from each photon action. I previously write about nesting MWI universes; it is

possible that linking these three items (energy, momentum and angular momentum) at photons and/or between atoms could also cause two MWI-universe events to depend on each other, possibly at different time scales, producing contingent, connected, and/or chronologically related new MWI universes.

Silver is an element that conducts electrons at two orbital levels simultaneously whereas I perceive with many other elements it is just one “external” orbital. Silver could have a wider possibly variety of MWI universe creation technologies as a result of its two electron conduction and/or quantum level effects. Nesting or contingencies at MWI universes could also be effected, possibly improved, or new forms generated, at silver systems.

There is a the slight possibility that silver used at new or previously described MWI verification/refutation/verification tests could heighten MWI test effectiveness. At one of a few previously described “wobble” MWI tests it is possible that the two electron system might produce a different amount of “wobble”, So a frequently mentioned “wobble” test where you have a about a billion locations (a billion is kind of like flashdrive electron tunneling plenum volume) on a chip made with IC technology, Then energize it with electrons or zap it with a laser, then find out if adjacent locations at the array do something novel, possibly from energy saturation/desaturation (note littler than electron possibility as well)

Planck length thing: If an electron event produces an MWI universe does that suggest that some measure, littler than an electron, would be beneficial at MWI tests? Possibly a novel, different than prediction, quantum level photon emission. If the MWI event causes saturation (greater local/initial universe energy) then the emissions spectra line might go up (because the thing is still working off **one electron**, so it could be beneficial to create a functional measurable that measures “wobble” that is compatible with a one electron change. At desaturation the “wobble” would cause the emissions spectra line to be lesser than the norm. Also I read about a thing that might be called a planck length or planck volume. Is there anything measurable that occupies

less planck volume than many other things, which, planck volume used, might change from MWI universe creation “wobble” So like, if a photon or electron “occupies” a particular planck volume, does some expansion or shrinkage event from “wobble” cause the planck volume to change? I do not know of a way to measure change in the planck volume of a photon or electron. Unless the thing where you have like a few hundred quantum entangled (linked) photons directed at one photon, or electron, or optimally a particle/wave of size: one planck length; Then change just one of the hundreds of linked photons thus causing a fractional effect at the one planck length/volume particle or photon system that is multiply entangled, then at that smaller than planck-length technology it is possible that the resistance to the change at

(ease of observability or change in ease of observability of the one of hundreds entangled photon) observing one of several hundred observable photons the entangled/linked photons could then measure “wobble”

Also, if planck volume is experimentally (as well as possibly predicted with theory) found to change when perturbing just one of hundreds of quantum entangled (linked) photons or matter things, or any other planck volume modifier be used as planck length technologies?

A quoran writes, “the photon is a quantum particle that therefore has a wave function and wave functions are complex valued functions of space and time such that the probability that the particle is at a particular position

and time is proportional to the absolute value of the wave function.” which reminds me of another quoran who wrote that the math efficacy of absolute value, like addition and multiplication is non-determined (my approximate phrase for “not math definition supported at some (frequently thought about) systems”) So if absolute value can be questioned on a math basis, and it is the math-root of quantum indeterminacy, then **it is possible there are math systems that replace quantum indeterminacy with some other thing; that math could generate new testable physics hypotheses.** Also, there is previously written material of **modifying**/verifying/refuting the MWI based on showing that parts of the schroedinger equation have nonvalid math. (Math thing: absolute value)

could refute/verify/modify MWI universe generation as well.

It looks like the partial applicability or nonapplicability of “Math thing: absolute value” could affect the MWI from a view of “the probability that the particle is at a particular position and time is proportional to the absolute value of the wave function.” so it could be that absolute value is an important part of the equations, or it could just be that (math thing: absolute value) easily models measured physics results.

Unlikely: previously written is material about D3 islands of truthiness and math also data structures: Where at, if you note a trend, or make a correlation, then it is math-system based to be a causation. I am uninformed but have a perception that

an electron is kind of like a “quantum smear”. It is possible there are valid mathematical statements or restatements about quantum things that have a D3 (an undecideability number system (D1, D3, etc) I thought of) region where at that math system, correlation is equal to causation.

That math, and a possible physics measured region, or group of perhaps **non-quantum physics**

measurements, could cause regions of quantum science to be more determined (from the correlation is causation math construction space) at certain realms of measurement, or being approximate, and relying overmuch on what little I know about statistics, causing some standard deviations at a normal distribution to have greater durability than the middle (most populated area) of the distribution when perturbed. So as

an experiment the physics person would find where a correlation goes with causation math region at some area of physics, perhaps optimally at atomic physics (although macroscopic “newtonian” physics correlation-math-linked-to-causation math system applied at particular physics systems adjustments would be nifty as well), then do things that modify the system, then see if some statistical parameter showed unusually durable or notable effects. So that would be finding a region of a quantum or classical system where the math constructions that cause correlation to always go with causation apply, and measuring the predicted, yet otherwise without previous explanation, change or durability effect.

So at MWI universes, **if there are**

universe generating quantum-smear resolution events that have notably particular math-regions where correlation always links to causation, then those MWI universe generating events could have a durable theme between and amongst separate measurements and/or measured systems. Translation: novel math finds things that “unpredicted previously, stick around” and were not previously predicted at quantum system math; The things that “persist between/amongst experiments” could have an effect on the MWI universes generated. So, is it possible that the D3 math systems where things are constructed such that correlation is always specifying of causation have applicability to various parts of physics or regions of behavior at actual materials and/or photons and

electrons and atomic nuclei. Those regions could have technological applications.

Quantum and or wave amusement: Stitching together wave versions or photons and/or matter: One quoran writes, "A system as simple as two emitters and two detectors just doesn't work with a wave model." so thinking about that as actual positionable sources and some double slit actual physics experiment, it could be possible to have two photon sources linearly a few cm away from each other such that the diffraction from the double slit rather than superimposing them causes them to be adjacent to each other, making what looks like one extra-lengthy wave. That ~ ~ lengthy version could have some technological application but is also reminiscent of a

unique math identity of things that can be wave produced with light (or electrons). like node, antinode, and now, adjacent lengthening! A meaningless application would be an audio enrichment setting at music. Make the double-length wave $\sim\sim$, analog or digitally then perhaps notice it sounded like layered recording polyphonics. A laser application could be cutting/welding lasers where two lasers spaced right, or more likely put through a diffraction slit, create the longer $\sim\sim$ -wave causing greater energy deposition; this from combining what might be smaller cheaper lasers. Although I am confused about how this effects frequency (I think it has no effect; consider a monochromatic laser, none of node or antinode, but: adjacentized to $\sim\sim$)

It is possible this approach ($\sim\sim$) to light could have some utility tessellating a surface. Tessellating a surface with light sounds nice. I have no clue, but better 2d or (even 3d) interferometry might be possible? Is Three-D interferometry already a thing? sounds facile, but possibly MRI or fMRI could benefit from 3d interferometry; it could increase resolution.

Another possibility, although this is obvious use of antinodal, is to layer two diffracted light waves on each other to go antinode at just half the physical length, producing a light spot of half the width, but at usual power, possibly useful for higher resolution point sources of light.

Quora: a quoran likely knows: If a magnet makes a static EM field, which

turns to electricity if something moves in it, can wave superposition at that EM field generated oscillation produce things like double length waves ~~, as well as the usual node and antinode forms? rather dubious, but perhaps a particular shape of magnet could produce a ||||| magnetic field spaced such that anything that moved through it generated double length waves of EM activity. Or similarly, node or antinode effects. So **a nodal EM magnet could increase the functional applied power at MRI and/or fMRI machines increasing resolution.**

.5B

Also MRI/fMRI: could chemicals, like biochemicals at the body, physically adjacent to each other, or just possibly, at some gigantic EM wavelength, actual physical

structures at the body (unlikely), cause the EM radio output that the MRI/fMRI detector detects have double length wave, nodal or antinodal effects? If a water next to a lipid caused some EM (node/antinode) radio effect variation then that could improve diagnostic ability and possibly physical resolution.

MWI test with modifying a distribution and seeing if MWI universe generation causes cumulative numeric effects. A quora person says, “Quantum mechanics describes the world in terms of probabilities, rather than definite outcomes” So a scientist could make something on an integrated circuit wafer that produces a really high homogeneity, notably predictable, normal distribution, have

that at an integrated circuit wafer, then zap the wafer with lasers to create MWI universe creating events near the probability circuits or geometric areas of the wafer; the thing is that each of the areas of the normal distribution curve, like standard deviation parts of the graph-curve, could then be measured as to greater than expected lack of change; greater than expected change, as well as multimodality/modality shifts. This is a little different than other described “wobble” wafer tests as rather than binary presence or absence of effect, or magnitude of effect at a specific measured thing, it accumulates trend. Also, there might be some benefit I lack awareness of: DQCE uses cumulative statistics on photon path to exhibit its effects, so there might be useful math or some kind of “nature is rarely an angular

wave function” measurement direction benefit.

Usually, but hey, why not think more, I think about MWI generated universes; but at non MWI multiverse theories, one survey is from Tegmark, one says that with enough space, and finite describable states of matter, there start to be repeats, so there are repeats of any particular person. One other thing seems to suggest that there could be many of these repeat universes at distances farther than light has travelled, thus perhaps suggesting some or many of the non MWI multiverses are outside the human and human’s universe’ lightcone.

So I read a book called “faster than light” or a lot like that title. It had a list of things that go faster than light, and one of them was radio waves at

the ionosphere. So, does that suggest radio waves at interstellar plasma have attributes that exceed lightspeed? If so, then some of the repeat universes could be a part of each others effect-cone. Also, just to entertain, consider an organism that only lives at radio waves in the ionosphere; it always lives faster than the speed of light. It could even benefit from an anthropic principle that causes a known-mechanism of faster than light velocity to exist with a sentience, cradling the entity who has an even wider variety of multiverses to visit than a human.

One could do physics actions, like experiments, that proceed from a benevolent effort to make the anthropic principle more beneficial to humans and other beings. Then, with benevolence carrying the day, it is

possible other beings might lend their effects to a MWI or multiverse generator/detector. Other beings might voluntarily support and physically do things that produce a more benevolent version of the anthropic principle. If other universes or beings perceive humans, and the humans are making something benevolent, they might assist, which on its own could be a detectable test of the MWI.

Also, sampling the “if you do not know anything you are statistically likely to be in the middle” statistical math concept, It is possible that humans live in a mid-range anthropic principle, with much opportunity for increased benevolence at many kinds of beings. It might be that creating technologies and thought systems (like ethics) to benevolently edit the anthropic

principle causes inclusion at benevolent sentience groups or universe connectabilities.

Thinking blue and white it is possible to think of many forms and methods to tune the anthropic principle benevolently. To write so daringly as to be plonk, you could do a wiki model where a plurality of humans as well as, as they might like to participate, benevolent beings, make pages about a benevolent anthropic principle topic and/or technology. One of them might be: Ways to figure out if your species is poised for benevolence reifying growth; then someone might bring up shifting the distribution of predictable MWI universes towards a greater plurality of benevolence reifying growth. Another wiki page might describe faster than light ionosphere sentiences and the way

that if not poised for benevolent reifying growth they might be poised for quality of living, feeling, and thinking improvements, and so multiverse/MWI technologies that move the distribution of universe creation and/or anthropic principle tuning towards more benevolent being, thought and feeling as compared with growth could be make a part of the wiki for public improvement.

One page at the wiki might be different sources of universes, which were more tunable, and which could be constructed or modified to communicate voluntarily.

Just a thought: if they do not already exist, making benevolent faster than light ionosphere radio communications sentient entities could be a benevolence effect at new

universes and/or anthropic principle newstructurings; Noting the amount of ionized gas scientists have found at interstellar areas, the way lasers can make ionized gas at a distance at lightspeed, and the moderate light year distances between stellar objects, notably a few near Earth, sentient faster than light ionosphere beings could support benevolent growth as well as heightening quality of being attributes. Thus at the wiki page on “being benevolent what should we do?” The verification, and/or contact and/or creation of beneficial, utilizing Dave Pearce’ Hedonistic imperative as an buildable base, faster than light ionosphere radio wave entities could be brought up.

Also, putting the benevolent MWI wiki at the various MWI test experiments (populate a flash drive or write it on a

wafer) might prompt other universe' beings to comment or contribute. So it is a benevolence hieghtening and attracting thing that could verify the MWI if there was new wiki activity.

Wikipedia describes a technology to observe things so much they cease chronological progression, “The **quantum Zeno effect** (also known as the **Turing paradox**) is a feature of quantum-mechanical systems allowing a particle's time evolution to be arrested by measuring it frequently enough with respect to some chosen measurement setting.[1]”

So using quantum Zeno effects as a benevolent MWI technology, perhaps it is possible to use zeno effects at different attributes to cause one area of a system to be more active than another. causing some kind of

beneficial surplus, greater capability, or possibly “freeze” what would have been non beneficial so it can be replaced with something new or previously known, that is beneficial. Humans are different than computers, so if you were benefitting a human you could decrease the perceptual amplitude of a neutral activity as a result of stretching out the chronology of how long it took. There are numerous other ways to make the birthing process more pleasant, but it is possible that a zeno approach to the feeling sensing mind could cause birth to happen with greater perceived rapidity and less felt stimuli.

So it is perhaps benevolently possible to heighten a variety of mental and physical attributes, then make them zeno-effect able to do customized reductions to create greater

benevolent happiness toward all beings at living. At the MWI universe generation and/or anthropic principle tuning it might be possible to make things like atoms, photons and electrons more observable at high precision, even using what at a nonoptimized MWI universe would be a less precise apparatus. Making observing things, possibly at depth/volume, even easier could make beneficial technologies like (previously written) superobservers even more capable at observing things into a preferred form.

wikipedia Zeno effect: “Sometimes this effect is interpreted as "a system can't change while you are watching it".[\[2\]](#) One can "freeze" the evolution of the system by measuring it frequently enough in its known initial

state. The meaning of the term has since expanded, leading to a more technical definition, in which time evolution can be suppressed not only by measurement: the quantum Zeno effect is the suppression of unitary time evolution in quantum systems provided by a variety of sources: measurement, interactions with the environment, stochastic fields, among other factors.[3] As an outgrowth of study of the quantum Zeno effect, it has become clear that applying a series of sufficiently strong and fast pulses with appropriate symmetry can also *decouple* a system from its decohering environment.”

The quantum Zeno effect could possibly rescue some matter or a source of being at a universe. If there is a physics environment with 3d

+time, as well as organic chemicals, being able to apply different velocities of quantum zeno effect at each of these could rescheduled and reorder a circumstance thought to be non-optimal.

Thinking of a benevolent MWI/multiverse wiki it seems like producing all benevolent is the way to proceed; the thing is I do not know if rescues (like zeno effect) are also valued. Just possibly I will get wiki feedback.

MWI test based on wearing a hole or producing waxy-build up in a nested MWI universe group. At quora <https://www.quora.com/Is-there-any-evidence-of-a-multiverse-1> it says, “Also, imagine a vast cloud of

instances of a single photon, some of which are stopped by a barrier. Are they absorbed by the barrier that we see, or is each absorbed by a different, quasi-autonomous barrier at the same location?

READER: Does it make a difference?

DAVID: Yes. **If they were all absorbed by the barrier we see, it would vaporize."**

So they seem to be suggesting that if one object was at two or more universes it would get twice the wear (or build up), and if one object was present at a bunch of universes it might get so dosed as to actually vaporize. So is it possible to **make things that simultaneously exist in two or a lot of MWI universes and then detect wear or gunky**

build-up on them? One possibility is the previously described Nested MWI universe where something like an optical fiber loop goes around a radioactive sample; since they have overlapping lightcones (Optical loop takes a while; while the radioactive blob makes many MWI events, embedded in the loop's universe.

Nicer: **skip the radioactivity and just do two or a plurality of nested optical loops with laser emitter detectors**) of the two or more MWI universe generating event and/or observation, one is contingent on, or sort of included, in the other geometrically. So if you make a big pile of optical loops do you create a plurality of MWI universes all of which are contingent on the outer loop that is noted for an emission and detection at an inclusive interval? If you do that then one of the loops might be

thought of as persisting across the many universes generated, so that loop could then be measured to find disintegration/destabilization and/or waxy build up. Using numeric measurements of light, finding the waxy build up or instability at that one particular optical loop system would verify the MWI.

Can the loops be replaced with an IC wafer or photonic chip pattern to make a few billion nested optical loops on a wafer; then see if that very large amount of nested contingent universes which might have a “tropism” towards being in the outer loop’s universe/observation from the MWI has a destabilizing/disintegrating or waxy build up effect? Optically plural MWI loop chips could also be used to try to produce “wobble” for measurement.

DQCE at wikipedia: (at the quantum choice eraser (QCE), different than DQCE) “a second beam splitter is introduced at the top right. It can direct either beam toward either exit port. Thus, photons emerging from each exit port may have come by way of either path. By introducing the second beam splitter, the path information has been "erased". Erasing the path information results in interference phenomena at detection screens positioned just beyond each exit port. What issues to the right side displays reinforcement, and what issues toward the top displays cancellation. “

So the nifty thing here is that the

geometry of the paths determines the outcome, and to from what I read, the retrocausality of the system; Now **is there a mathematical most parsimonious description of this geometry**. That (possible restatement of geometry to instantaneous-solution algebra) makes a math parsimonious description of a time technology or new time theory. A math version of a parsimonious QCE (quantum choice eraser) could then be used as a basis for novel theories and predictions of effective and or unusual or “grouped” geometries at actual technological objects. So the math could predict and suggest the actual physics technologies that do things with time.

Wikipedia says of the 1999 AD DCQE, “If events at D_1 , D_2 , D_3 , D_4 determine outcomes at D_0 , then effect seems to

precede cause. If the idler light paths were greatly extended so that a year goes by before a photon shows up at D_1 , D_2 , D_3 , or D_4 , then when a photon shows up in one of these detectors, it would cause a signal photon to have shown up in a certain mode a year earlier.” So a mathematician-physicist coming up with a parsimonious, possibly tessallatable version of this mathematically might get the retrocausal effect with a

It seems well travelled, but: at a cellular automata or Turing machine they could use DCQE or other retrocausal and/or time technologies to predo prgrams and calculations; one DCQE plausibility is case statements as optical paths; at cellular automata, being able to send perhaps three electrons, or three high voltage/current waveforms backwards

in time along retrocausal case-statement-like pathways could provide the energy at an integrated circuit or laser geometry to do actual calculations at a cellular automata, possibly better than the turing-functional 1,1,0 automata. So the power would flow retrocausally at new calculations, supporting their accumulation and effectiveness.

Computing with DCQE/QCE: could the wikipedia description of some **detector measurements (like D1) be used to adjust which of the other detector measurements are viewed first?** That way something like a computer could be constructed from changing the pathway dynamically, where detector changed path to detector, with sequential retrocausality, Also, detector specifying path of detector at the

calculation generates new changed material that the laser, once detected, puts at storage.

Wikipedia DQCE, QCE section:

“Elementary precursors to current quantum-eraser experiments such as the "simple quantum eraser" described above have straightforward classical-wave explanations. Indeed, it could be argued that there is nothing particularly quantum about this experiment.” That is novel and amazing. **So if I comprehend what it says, water waves and acoustic waves can do a QCE retrocausal effect thing.** If that is actually true, **then some macroscopic systems could have bulk-material retrocausal effects.** Vaguely,, at audio waves, this might produce the sound of the record that this one is not. Or, it could be that the “case

statement” of possible outcomes at the actual geometry of a structured experiment have separate audio tone values, and that a different tone is simply heard at a retrocausal instantiation. Notably this new retrocausal tone is different than, and adds to, the node/antinode/double-length effects from waves group. Also notable is that it might be one item from a list of case statement based on the actual acoustic reflector-geometry utilized. So that is new to me.

Perhaps this retrocausal case statement of available wave forms could somehow be used to case-statement-like swap in or out a more optimal light or sound frequency at things like integrated circuit production. Perhaps there is a better microscope possible as well, **as it**

oscillates along the case statement until it retrocausally dynamically detects it is in focus at a particular (classical!)

wavelength, from what I perceive of what I read, this trying every version at a case statement-like source of waveform identity could possibly be accomplished retrocausally multiple times before finding the optimal resolution frequency. Even though it finds an optimal frequency, the technological object (microscope) would be perceived as being in-focus when you turned it on. Possibly integrated circuit making lasers that power-up to always be in focus have value, as would be retrocausal-dynamic case statement semiconductor lasers at a variety of applications (possibly internet/telecom) where it was at the optimal frequency when started up.

Also semiconductor and other integrated circuit manufacturing could benefit from better focus at lasers. With sufficient physics education, it is possible that the “classical physics” that support retrocausality at QCE could be used to adjust frequency and/or wavelength of a laser.

Wikipedia on CQE and retrocausality: “the interference pattern does disappear when the photons are so marked. However, the interference pattern reappears if the which-path information is further manipulated *after* the marked photons have passed through the double slits to obscure the which-path markings. Since 1982, multiple experiments have demonstrated the validity of the so-called quantum “eraser”.”

One thing at wikipedia might possibly

say that the time to collect all the measurements is speed of light dependent, "The delayed-choice quantum eraser does not communicate information in a retro-causal manner because it takes another signal, one which must arrive by a process that can go no faster than the speed of light, to sort the superimposed data in the signal photons into four streams that reflect the states of the idler photons at their four distinct detection screens" So I am being simplistic here, but could you make one with double entangled (linked) photons. I read an article that said quantum linked photons communicate state at least 10,000 times faster than light; could you use that additional available change of state, instead of the light velocity arrival time/interval of the idler/detector photons to

communicate. I am clueless.

wikipedia on DQCE: “Alternatively, knowledge of the future fate of the idler photon would determine the activity of the signal photon in its own present. Neither of these ideas conforms to the usual human expectation of causality. However, knowledge of the future, which would be a hidden variable, was refuted in experiments” The thing is though that if you do a case-statement-like path modification from observation, like the DCQE, I perceive it as causing a computable effect; at some computed effects the future identity is mathematically known,

Depending on what you compute, and the math it is made out of, you get a new or premade future knowable state. At some math the future

findable state is a defined thing. In some editable-to-be-descriptive-way: Computer program output can function as a determined, follows-from-definitions, known-at-math output, **but not known to the observing human user of the DCQE computer.** Being wildly speculative, **you could put math equations, or possibly some set theory axioms at at DQCE computer, and then see/verify/be cognizant that only the ones with global static-state-space future-proof “truth value” are produced. That is unless the DCQE computer program can “know the future”** So, **it either tells you what math, possibly even new kinds or categories of math, will actually work, or it can iteratively compute, making use of the future.**

The program could of course generate a nonrepeating integer or be a novelty, nonpredictability producing cellular automata. Although these iterated novelties are “circleable” with math, I think they are not identity specified.

Wikipedia on DQCE, “data pertinent to photons that form it are only erased later in time than the signal photons that hit the primary detector. Not only that feature of the experiment is puzzling; D_0 can, in principle at least, be on one side of the universe, and the other four detectors can be “on the other side of the universe” to each other” Just being technological: That suggests that distributed computer systems with zero latency are possible, and that **looking to natural phenomena, like quantum**

entangling photons with ice crystals in the atmospheres of other planets, could be a source of pre-existing editable past to change the human present.

Enthusied technologists could produce technological objects
Now to make future humans able to edit their past starting at when the first retrocausal DQCE public technologies are produced.
(earlier if the ice crystals on other planets thing works)

Also entertaining would be a **quantum tunneling flash drive with about a billion or more locations, where the containered areas with the tunneled electrons in them are the various D1-D4 detectors at the DQCE.** It is kind of elaborate but perhaps a CCD version

of an amplifying pathway could feed the voltage effect that causes the electrons to write-tunnel, and the many varied possible utility-filled geometries of observation and retrocausal change, could come from plugging the flash-drive like thing into a computer and reading the memory in purposeful ways, some of which might cause the equivalent to parallel computation. Writing CCD or quantum tunneling flash memory and reading it at a computer could be a nonlaser DQCE. Although I think electrons can be quantum-particularized, I do not know if it is possible to fill a flash-drive array location with one quantum state of electron, at a plurality of electrons, such that something external to the flash drive array location can sense/report the state. That may or may not effect things. QCE is

described as “classical”. Lasers are nifty though.

QCE and DQCE remind me of the multiple pathways exploredism of quantum computing; it is possible multiple pathways being explored could be notably cheaper or easier with arrayed geometries of DCQE computer path-circuits. I also like quantum computing.

Or, just possibly, retrocausal laser adjustment could up the amount of quantum entangled photons produced at a device; generating a high intensity source of quantum entangled photons, which may have robot sensor applications.

Not an actual idea or technology but a turn of phrase that I wondered about, “States evolve according to the Schrodinger equation (unitary evolution of the ray in Hilbert Space)” I do not know what they mean, it sounds like some nifty new thing that differs from iteration, but is perhaps different than a high school student “solving for” with the simplification or restatement of an equation. “[quantum]states evolve” means what?

It has been previously written but it is possible that just as some people at a distribution have novel actual senses **it is possible that some unknown fraction of the beliefs and verbal statements of the mentally ill are actual fresh observational data about the universe(s) and also previously unknown, likely**

sometimes, physics-describable actions of agency on the universe. *Computers could sort through common and unusual themes at the mentally ill, notably schizophrenics.* People like schizophrenics could also be measured with the proximity of multifunction physics detectors (lasers, quantum tunneled electrons, a thing like a tube with a gas or liquid in it and a transducer to make waves; then see if the waves and their mathematical description deviate from classical physics predictions based on being physically near to, or focused upon from a schizophrenic) to see if these people, many of whom to my perception, think they affect reality around them from their being, as compared with their action, effect things.

The value of the bulk measurement of the physics effects of these schizophrenic people is to find any actual new effects on measureable nature, and then, possibly benefitting the schizophrenics (although the technological benefits reach everyone) to winnow, connect, possibly support, or even refute the schizophrenics' explanation of why they affect things around them. Technologizing the new areas of influence or change at physics from finding and measuring effects produced near the mentally ill, such as schizophrenics, could produce beneficial things.

If an effect from schizophrenics is found at physics detectors then the effect of antipsychotic medications, and the effect of psychoactive drugs at well persons could be measured

and studied.

One piece of research that could be duplicated and reloaded is a French study of regular people affecting a double slit-like experiment; based on being in the room and having an intent. Repeating that, verifying that, then testing different groups, including schizophrenics, to see if there are any human groups or phenotypes that have greater effect on the measured system could find mind and body forms that have new effects on physics.

The thing here which differs slightly from, but supports “I support research” is the **creation and mass production of an omnifunction physics measurer** and tranches of beliefs/group classifications/cladistics with software that finds people who

think they affect things, and also actually do.

I am on medication for paranoid schizophrenia. My remembered version, which is that a human being who said they were hosting (my word-interpretation) a “Loa” (the word the entity used) told me some accurate predictions about my future. Along with various things about how I might possibly effect society with my mind and actual behavior, I was told I have an effect on others around me that would beneficially affect their attraction to me. Now, from a science perspective this is testable. Just have the computer screen a few hundred thousand schizophrenics’ personal narratives and their own symptom descriptions to find the ones that think their charisma has been heightened. Then have them interact

with others, measure attraction, and look for deviations from a predicted value.

Also there is a word Pareidolia which is approximately seeing patterns in shapes and geometries around you. Before I was on medication this was a continuous, and reacted to, effect. I have spoken with another person who I perceive might be diagnosably schizophrenic, who believes that birds cluster around him to communicate in real time his functionality at the universe. **It is possible that a computer could do cladistics on the most frequent kinds and thing-meaning typologies of pareidolia patterns.** Then these patterns which are perceived as saying a lot about things, could be found at nature or at the human produced environment, and then have

those natural occurrences omniphysics measured and/or tested to see if they have greater than chance (statistically valid) predictability at an environment or situation of meaning. New physics could result if a physics multiaspect measurement thing was placed at high pareidolia occurrences/things/locations. Both the pareidolia of mentally well persons and schizophrenics could be researched/measured things.

Some of the time there might be novel, yet non-new physics results. I do not wear a hat but I think I am a kind of white hat person. Before medication I thought each garment color and pattern described the personality and behavior pathways of the person who was wearing it; perhaps contextually, right then, while they were wearing it.

So, software that correlates the things schizophrenics think, with what they see, and say they see, **could also find new ordinary well human correlations and cultural concentrations**; I prefer to be near people that wear white, one already actual cultural idea is that of being a white hat person, if the white-hat concept did not already exist at society it might be first found at considering and measuring, the kind of personalities that wear lots of white. Software that processes the paroledolia of clusters of well or schizophrenic persons could do this. This would create a new cultural benefit, the applicable and live-action functional thing of people seeking out others who wear white.

Many other novel correlates and

associations from measuring and software processing of paeidolia could benefit the living culture of the mentally well, and also perhaps soothe and benefit the mentally ill. Also, software concentrated branches and tranches of paredolia meanings/thoughts/feelings at well persons (and schizophrenics) is perhaps a novel area for visual (and other culture) to expand in. Emphasizing beneficial paredolia finds and devlops new fresh art sources; rather than archetypes, these paredolia, previously unstudied while being actively effective yet are pre-cultural awareness. Beneficial paredolia measured effects on both thought content and thought feeling, and emotive feeling could benefit many people. Finding new kinds of wearing white.

unplausible thought on the multiverse,
as compares with MWI;

a person at quora writes, “What
multiverses (should that be a plural?)
have going for them is that

- they’re conceivable (but that’s the
lowest possible bar)”
-
- which made me think that perhaps if
things are made more conceivable
then more things will be conceived.
Material between “((“ is perhaps more
optimal to avoid reading or doing and
could have actual risk
-
- ((conception amplifiers are varied:
magnifying glasses, math, also noting
inferences, things like digit memory-
span, cleanliness (possibly like a non
item-dissolving high contrast
background) a dicer that chops a
vegetable so you can fit it in your
mouth, So this brings up, is there a

listable bunch of things that makes MWI testability and/or multiverse verification lost more conceivable? Eugenics is one.

noting all the ways a math set can be empty, do continual updates to physics increase the size of a list of things that can produce an empty set, “no hydrogen atom”, “outside of lightcone”; is it possible that the number of things that can produce a populationless set is either actually nonfinite or if finite, enumerable yet big. So that could be a new area of set theory, how many ways there are to produce an unpopulated set; and sort of, It is possible that if set theory is modified to have two related infinities: the things that can go in a a set, and the things that make an unpopulated set, then at a kind of geometry the concept of the set, or even its math definition, would have

new different attributes; it is possible to causally and ignorantly imagine that sets, newly defined as having two infinities, might tile or tessellate differently, which then makes a person think about Venn diagrams being improved to show their novel redefined sets' quasi deep pockets/liquid repellant surfaces... So I might be thinking that new mathematics would make things more conceivable, and it is possible that some description of the math of sets could be made more: case: nugget, descriptive, functional, omniconsistent, able to tolerate things like "the set of things I will never know about" when the math is structured for you to look at the set contents,

The set of (exceptions to sequence) could trim and edit, or focus and prominentize particular things about

any proffered multiverse/MWI theory. The universes that could happen “when” things are accomplished only at geometrical moments where iteration and/or difference lacks neighbors, or has twice the average number of neighbors, or some precise integer number of neighbors would likely look and behave differently from each other. It seems immoderate, it is possible that a set that contains a non-finite quantity of time form changes could increase conception while decreasing resolution.))

